



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,893	01/28/2005	Pauli Koutonen	FORSAL-99	7248

36528 7590 03/21/2007
STIENNON & STIENNON
612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201
P.O. BOX 1667
MADISON, WI 53701-1667

EXAMINER

KIM, SANG K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3654

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-12 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 is indefinite and vague. What do you mean by "the winding operation in connection with each set"? What is considered to be "each set"?

In claims 12 and 19, the phrase, "regulating the tension of the web before a windup and/or by regulating winding force and/or by regulating radian nip load," is indefinite and vague. Examiner cannot determine whether the features stated above are inclusive together or exclusive in alternative form.

In claim 16, lines 11-12, "winding a second web roll in the apparatus at the changed wrap angle; and measuring the second web roll hardness distribution," is indefinite and vague. Is applicant referring to a completely new roll or simply referring to "a second web roll" as the web being wound on the same roll but changing the wrap angle which makes the current web different from the previous wound web?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 3654

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9315632 A.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, JP '632 discloses applicant's claimed invention, as shown in figures 1-2. A system for winding a web 4 into a web roll 2 by leading the web through a winding nip (no reference number assigned) defined between said web roll and a winding drum 1, the web defining a first wrap angle (θ_1) as the web passes through the nip, the wrap angle being the amount the web wraps the winding drum before entering the nip when the wrap angle is positive or negative (note, the wrap angle is relative to depending on which point of origin is measured from), measuring a hardness distribution of the web roll and changing the wrap angle in response to the measured hardness distribution is inherently taught since the wrap angle can change from the start values to desired values, see paragraph [0008].

Winding a fibrous web is notoriously old and well known for operating and manufacturing apparatus of all kinds, including winders. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a specific type of web into the web roll.

Regarding claims 9-12 and 17-19, as stated above, JP '362 discloses changing the wrap angle and regulated by moving the position of at least one guide roll 3, since the web is wound between the rolls, it prevents slippage of the web, see figures 1-2.

Regarding claims 13-14, as stated above, JP '362 discloses changing the wrap angle, which inherently changes the roll hardness distribution of the roll.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9315632 A, in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent No. 4463586.

As stated above, JP '362 discloses changing the wrap angle in a slitter machine but does not explain explicitly how the wrap angle is controlled.

Griffin discloses the concept of using a closed loop system which controls the wrap angle, see abstract.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of JP '362 with a closed loop system for controlling the wrap angle taught by Griffin, in order to accurately adjust the wrap angle.

Claims 8-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al., U.S. Patent No. 4199117.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, Muller '117 discloses applicant's claimed invention, as shown in figures 1-4. A system for winding a web into a web roll 6 by leading the web through a winding nip (no reference number assigned) defined between said web roll and a winding drum 6, the web defining a first wrap angle (α) as the web passes through the nip, the wrap angle being the amount the web wraps the winding drum before entering the nip when the wrap angle is positive or negative (note, the wrap angle is relative to depending on which point of origin is measured from), measuring a hardness distribution of the web roll and changing the wrap angle in response to the

Art Unit: 3654

measured hardness distribution is inherently taught since the wrap angle can change from one position to another position.

Winding a fibrous web is notoriously old and well known for operating and manufacturing apparatus of all kinds, including winders. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a specific type of web into the web roll.

Regarding claims 9-12 and 17-19, as stated above, Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle and regulated by moving the position of at least one guide roll (3, 4), since the web is wound between the rolls, it prevents slippage of the web, see column 1, lines 30-35.

Regarding claims 13-14, as stated above, Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle, which inherently changes the roll hardness distribution of the roll.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al., U.S. Patent No. 4199117, in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent No. 4463586.

As stated above, Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle in a slitter machine but does not explain explicitly how the wrap angle is controlled.

Griffin discloses the concept of using a closed loop system which controls the wrap angle, see abstract.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Muller '117 with a closed loop system for controlling the wrap angle taught by Griffin, in order to accurately adjust the wrap angle.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. For example, U.S. Patent No. 6427939 B1, shows changing of the wrap angle with respect to the roll being wound.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANG KIM whose telephone number is 571-272-6947. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford, can be reached on (571) 272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SK

3/19/07


GENE C. CRAWFORD
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER